covered with pale erect hairs, which are somewhat longer than the distances between them. Head inclined ventrally more or less at a right angle to the body. Mouth parts feebly chitinized and pale yellowish. Mandibles subtriangular, very long and sharp-pointed, with the apex slightly curved. Maxillae with a lateral conical papilla, which is rather large and slightly curved. Differing somewhat from the common ponerine type and showing a certain resemblance to the doryline *Eciton*. (Freely translated from the Spanish.) Figure of mouth parts and photographs of larva in side and ventral views, p. 114.

Literature Cited

Bernard, F. 1951. Super-famille des Formicoidea, p. 997-1104. *In* P. P. Grassé [ed.] Traité de Zoologie (Paris: Masson et Cie). Tome X, Fasc. II.

Bruch, C. 1925. Macho, larva y ninfa de Acanthostichus ramosmexiae Bruch. Physis 8: 110-115.

Creighton, W. S. 1950. The ants of North America. Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool. Harvard College 104: 1-585, 57 pl.

Emery, C. 1899. Intorno alle larve di alcune formiche. Mem. R. Accad. Sci. Ist. Bologna 8: 3-10.

————. 1901. Studi sul polimorfismo e la metamorfosi nel genere Dorylus. Rend. Sess. R. Accad. Sc. Ist. Bologna, N. S. 5: 415-433.

————. 1904. Le affinità del genere Leptanilla e i limiti delle Dorylinae. Arch. Zool. 2: 107-116.

Kusnezov, N. 1962. El género Acanthostichus Mayr. Acta Zool. Lilloana 18: 121-138.

Wheeler, G. C. 1950. Ant larvae of the subfamily Cerapachyinae. Psyche 57: 102-113.

———— **& Jeanette Wheeler.** 1960. The ant lavae of the subfamily Myrmicinae. Ann. Entom. Soc. Amer. 53: 98-110.

NOTES AND TWO NEW GENERA

(Lepidoptera: Noctuidae)

John G. Franclemont, *Department of Entomology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York*

The following notes and the new genera described here are extracted from manuscripts and published to make them available for use by other workers.

AMPHIPYRINAE

Iodopepla Genus Novum

Type: *Ceramica u-album* Guenée, 1852, = *Iodopepla u-album* (Guenée).

The species upon which this genus is based has had a rather checkered taxonomic existence. It was described three times by different workers, each time in a different genus; in addition it has been placed in *Mamestra*, *Hydroecia*, and *Gortyna*. In 1908 Hampson

(Catalogue of the Lepidoptera Phalaenae in the British Museum, vol. 7, p. 597) placed it in the genus *Phuphena* Walker, 1858, where it remained until Forbes in 1954 (Cornell Univ. Agr. Exp. Sta. Mem. **239**: 210), following a suggestion of mine that it might be related to *Oligia*, placed it questionably in that genus. A critical study of the type of *Phuphena* and related species revealed little in common between these species and *u-album*. The moth is of uncertain position, but it may be an outlier of the genera centering around *Oligia;* if this is so, then Grote's placement of the species in *Apamea* Ochsenheimer, 1816, when he described it under the name *purpuripennis* would be close to the true position. Smith's placement in *Hydroecia* Guenée, 1841 (1893, Bull. U. S. Natl. Mus., **44**: 177; and 1899, Trans. Amer. Ent. Soc., **25**: 15) merely reflects a change in name, the use of *Hydroecia* for *Apamea*. Grote later (1895, Abhandlungen des naturwissenschaftlichen Vereins zu Bremen **14**: 43) used *Gortyna* Ochsenheimer, 1816, for the complex called *Hydroecia* by Smith.

Description: Head with front clothed with erect scales, vertex with erect scales, scales at level of antennae shorter than those of front and vertex, which appear tufted; palpi upcurved, appressed to front, reaching to upper ¾ of eye, first and second segments clothed with scales and fringed outwardly with short narrow scales, third segment clothed with scales; proboscis well developed; antennae in male with the segments well marked ventrally (subserrate), pubescent and ciliate, in female simple and pubescent with cilia reduced. Thorax clothed with scales and a few intermixed hair-like scales; neither patagia nor tegulae set off; a low, spreading, median tuft behind patagia, and another on caudal third. Forewing with outer margin of membrane crenulate; R_2 from outer fourth of accessory cell, R_{3+4} stalked for one-fifth their length from apex of accessory cell, R_5 from apex of accessory cell, connate at base with stalk of R_{3+4}; M_2, M_3, and Cu_1 arising equidistant from one another. Hindwing with outer margin crenulate, moderately broadly and deeply excavated between M_1 and M_3; R_8 and M_1 from apex of discal cell; M_3 and Cu_1 from lower angle of discal cell. Forelegs of male with a tuft of long narrow scales from base of tibia, absent in female; hind femora in both sexes fringed above with long hair-like scales; tarsi with three rows of spines beneath. Abdomen clothed with scales, with some long hair-like scales on basal three segments.

Male genitalia with tegumen and vinculum moderate; uncus small; juxta with lateral apical angles prolonged into long, scobenate arms; valves about three times as long as broad, produced into an extended flap below cucullus; cucullus well set off, produced into a point at outer angle bearing a heavy spine, and with numerous long setae; clasper broad, produced into a short, rounded process dorsally; editum raised, prominent, with numerous setae; sacculus simple. Aedeagus short, with a scobinate patch near apex and a scobinate projection at apex opposite patch; vesica armed with two bulbous based cornuti and a broad, ribbed and rugose, sclerotized band for almost entire length.

Female genitalia with ovipositor valves membraneous; both pairs of apophyses stout; bursa with four heavy, longitudinal signa of about equal length; last abdominal sternite deeply cleft at ostium, the margins of cleft rugose.

For the time being the genus may be placed near *Oligia*, but it differs in several fundamental features of the genitalia of both sexes.

The articulation between the tegumen and vinculum is simple, and the valves of the female genitalia are membraneous, not heavily sclerotized as in *Oligia*.

I had thought that it might be possible to place this genus in its true position when we knew more about the East Asian fauna, but the discovery of another species, apparently endemic to Cuba, has caused me to be less positive. It may still, however, be one of the group of relict forms which is represented in Eastern North America by one or two species and in East Asia by a like number.

PLUSIINAE

In his revision of the North American Plusiinae (Mem. So. California Acad. Sci., **2**: 216), McDunnough uses the generic name *Agrapha* Hübner, [1821], (Verzeichniss bekannter Schmettlinge [sic], p. 250) for *aerea* Hübner, crediting Dyar (1902, Jour. New York Ent. Soc., **10**: 81) with citing this species as type. He overlooked a short note by Grote in the Entomologist's Record of 1896 (**8**: 303) entitled, "Generic Types in Plusia," in which Grote designates *Phal[aena] Noct[ua] glauca* Cramer as the type of *Agrapha*.

The original proposal of *Agrapha* included two species, *aerea* Hübner and *ahenea* Hübner with *glauca* Cramer 311 G cited as a synonym. *Phalaena glauca* Cramer, 1780 (Papillons Exotiques, vol. 4, p. 45, pl. 311, fig. G) is a homonym of *Phalaena glauca* Cramer, 1777 (Papillons Exotic, vol. 2, p. 17, pl. 107, fig. E). The figure of *glauca* (pl. 311, fig. G is only fair, but it is a Plusiine, and there seems to be no question but that it is the species described by Druce in 1889. (Biologia Centrali-Americana, Lipidoptera Heterocera, vol. 1, p. 332, pl. 30, fig. 17) as *Plusia longicornis*. Hübner's name *ahenea* should be used for this species in the future.

The two species *aerea* and *ahenea* are not congeneric, thus McDunnough's usage of *Agrapha* for *aerea* cannot stand. Kostrowicki in 1961 (Acta Zoologica Cracoviensia, **6**: 396) treats *Agrapha* in the sense of Dyar and McDunnough, and as a synonym of *Plusia* Ochsenheimer, 1816. I think that McDonnough was correct in regarding *aerea* as representing a genus distinct from *Plusia*. The genitalia of both sexes are more like those of the species which Kostrowicki included in his genus *Macdunnoughia* in 1961 than like any of the species included in *Plusia*. The development and sclerotization of the sacculus is like the species of *Macdunnoughia* and unlike any species of *Plusia;* the clasper and armature of the vesica of the aedoeagus differ from both genera. The female genitalia have a short, thick ductus bursae, agreeing with *Macdunnoughia* and not *Plusia;* the bursa lacks the signum of *Macdunnoughia;* and the ostial plates differ from both genera. For *Agrapha* McDunnough, 1944 (Mem. So. California Acad. Sci. **2**: 216) the name **ALLAGRAPHA genus novum** is proposed with *Noctua aerea* (Hübner), [1800/03], = *Allagrapha aerea* (Hübner) as type and only included species.